

Amendments to the Drawings:

The formal drawing Replacement Sheets attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 6 and 9-13 are being presented as new formal drawing sheets to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheets. The drawing figures 6 and 9-13 have been amended. The specific changes which have been made are listed below:

FIGURE 6:

Processing for TS17, TS18, and TS19 have been boxed as requested by examiner.

FIGURES 9-13:

The label --PRIOR ART-- has been added.

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed May 5, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-4 were pending in the application. Claim 1, 3, and 4 have been amended, claims 5-7 have been added and no claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

This amendment changes and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Objections to the Drawings and Specification

FIGS. 6 and 9-13 have been amended to address the issues raised in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action. Six formal drawing Replacement Sheets for these figures are attached hereto.

The specification has been amended to address the issues noted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to for minor informalities. In reply, applicant has amended the claim to address the issue raised in the Office Action and submit that the pending claims are unobjectionable.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alleged applicant's admitted prior art (hereafter "AAPA") in view of U.S. patent 5,724,351 to Chao et al. (hereafter "Chao") in further view of U.S. patent 6,269,439 ("Hanaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 3, and 4 recite a distributed pipeline scheduling system/scheduler or method that independently assigns time slots of the same size to

information transfer processing and reservation processing, respectively. This recited feature is not taught or suggested by the applied prior art.

As acknowledged in the office action, neither AAPA nor Chao discloses that that a scheduler independently assigns time slots to information transfer processing and reservation processing, respectively. See page 5 of the office action. Instead, the office action relies on Hanaki for disclosing independently assigning time slots to different stages of a pipeline processor. However, Hanaki only discloses that each stage of processing an instruction is performed in one cycle of the processor. Therefore, Hanaki does not disclose determining time slots for performing specific recited tasks, information transfer processing and reservation processing, and assigning time slots of the same size for these specific tasks. There is simply no teaching of independently assigning time slots of a same size for performing the specific tasks (1) information transfer processing, and (2) reservation processing, respectively, that are recited in each of the independent claims 1, 3, and 4. Therefore, none of the prior art, either singly or in reasonable combination, disclose or suggest independently assigning time slots of a same size for performing both information transfer processing and reservation processing, respectively.

Since at least this claimed feature is missing from the applied references, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending independent claims as required by 35 U.S.C §103. Accordingly, the independent claims 1, 3, and 4 are patentable over the applied prior art.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional features which are patentable when considered as a whole.

Specifically, each of the new claims 5, 6, and 7 recite that the time slots of the same size are determined as being the largest among (a) time for information transfer reception and information expansion, (b) time for reservation processing, and (c) time for format conversion and information transfer transmission. This claimed feature is disclosed in figure 3 of the originally filed application. None of the applied prior art disclose or show that time slots of

the same size are determined as recited in these claims. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the applied prior art for this additional reason. It is thus submitted that the PTO has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103, and thus applicant's claims are patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 4, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By _____

Aaron C. Chatterjee
David A. Blumenthal
Registration No. 26,257
Aaron C. Chatterjee
Registration No. 41,398
Attorneys for Applicant